

December 2004 - Internal Stakeholders Meeting

Wausau Meeting 12/8/04 (~20 people)

Leaders: Connie Antonuk, Deb Pingel, Sue Bangert

Purpose, Context, Criteria, AI's format (vision, management systems, structure)

How we got here

- Comments into categories summarized – input from all summarized into a nutshell
- Improvement Opportunities
- Developed business functions
- Associated management systems with the functions

Go through the Grid, then structure

Management Systems Grid

- Comment: The Grid Options column is misleading: Options with plural, pick a couple of options to choose from at the meeting, with only one option it seems like a 'final' recommendation.
- What does centralized mean?
- Looking at HW licensing centralized probably makes sense.
- The strategic plan calls for local contacts,
- Centralized functions in the bureau should be policy development, program evaluation, technical expertise as outlined in the Grant Thornton report. Program Implementation in the field. Majority of decisions should be local decisions. Local decision-making is still the same.
- Avoid the swinging pendulum – always reacting to a political influence. Don't create options that swing the pendulum to far in the opposite direction, so we don't go full circle. Keep changes smaller and less radical.
- When we take this out to the externals, we should avoid the term centralized – they like the local contacts. Need a definition of centralized.
- Technology is such that centralized can mean anywhere. Use specialized service, rather than centralized. Need a definition of centralized..
- Easy to ferret out what we need to do, hard part is how we do that work. Will there be a check and balance in for the personalities we have in the program. Dinosaur didn't become a bird in 2 days – took longer. Evolve rather than radical change.
- Need to have an evaluation stage.
- Team effectiveness example – spent a lot of time on that, what difference did it make since it was not really implemented – need an evaluation of the redesign to make sure that we actually implement. In the Team effectiveness we only implemented the low hanging fruit, and ignored other recommendations.
- Business Functions – we talk about streamlining – dangerous to streamline too much – how much do we streamline, clarify what is meant by streamlining. Use a check-list type of system, where the facility does the work and the DNR audits those.
- Self-Certification – not pro or con; when looking at low risk facilities – how does that impact the fees structure? Would we require fees? Recommend that we have fees associated with self-certification. Think about an inspection fee for those facilities

that we have to inspect. 10% may be randomly audited, so we'll have the staff – still need to have fee associated.

- With some functions already self-certified, and have the opportunity to audit since they are an on-going activity. For the one-time disposal, we can no longer audit after. Use the notification format like asbestos with a 10-day window so if we want to inspect, we can. This would be dependent on a 3rd party inspection. Consider a consultant to do the inspection. We should also maintain a deed notice for the one-time disposal situations.
- Open Burning example – fees can be used to do the right thing. If there is a fee associated with burning a building, they may not want to burn due to the fact that there is a fee charged.
- Transfer stations and compost have licensing – should keep the licensing, also the plan review fees.
- Do we need statutory changes for self-certification? Yes.
- If an external stakeholder reads pros and cons – see the sticky notes.
- Solid waste technical plan review:
- Technical review – good idea to erase the regional boundaries, need to make sure that the signature authority is clear with the authority clearly laid out if there are disagreements. The fewer signatures the better. Have the regional supervisor make the final decision. Manual code may have to be changed to reflect any changes in the program for plan review.
- Would not want to have the experts sign off, potential for a lot of disagreement that doesn't have to be there. May not be too different than what is going on now? Involved in precedent-setting issues. Too many sign offs may make the process too cumbersome.
- Currently status quo with Bob and Chris reviewing the work. That lets the regions use the engineers to do other things.
- Need to address the accountability with plan review staff. Work horses do the work and no accountability for those staff that don't do the work.
- Experts shouldn't have supervisory or signature authority. Adds a layer. Will that add time?
- Consistency in decision-making: Calling a person an expert is not addressing the real issue – consistency.
- Viable engineering and hydrogeologist need to have flexibility – short-sighted option for short-term solution – need more flexibility with this option..
- If not assigned to the site, won't have familiarity with the people or the site. The history of the site is important during reviews.
- Status quo is OK. Haven't really addressed the consistency. We now are doing the review. All the people need to have ability to do this work not just a few designated staff in the state.
- Plenty of work, sometimes we don't, and engineers not doing engineering work and they're doing specialist work, like inspections. The proposed option allows for statewide use of staff.
- Do we have the right mix of people in each of the regions for the work?
- Want to make sure that the externals talk to the local level – not call the 'expert'. If a precedent setting issue, the contact may come from the bureau.
- Decentralized files need to be accounted for, may make it more difficult to review the file.

- Meeting deadlines – the clock – need to get to know the sites, need to access the site (across the state) – need to make statutory changes – can't get the work done in the time we have – more complex sites, more complex technology.
- Another option is to stop the clock, or that our decision is going to be no.
- Mentoring needs to occur more – have less experienced staff shadow more senior staff. This will take time, it will fulfill a needed training function.
- Question on company-wide approval. What does this mean? Company like a large solid waste company where all transfer facilities would be covered under one approval. Doesn't think company-wide landfill approval is a good idea.
- Work with local fire departments on inspections – may not see the efficiencies. Doesn't see how that might work. Rural volunteer FD, vs urban FD. Concept is that FD would use one of our check-lists and then send that into us. Cooperative effort with FD, that would shorten our time-frame. Include under outreach.
- Transition inspection work to FD. Will FD want the work – un-funded mandate – they may get upset. Should we leave it on for the external document? Perhaps explore this rather than a statement.
- Concentrate on the problem facilities, and let the other inspections go, rather than doing them. Example: 3 demo sites – 2 doing well, 1 is a problem. Should focus on the problem site and not the well-operated site. Example with the complaint. Give the flexibility to figure where they need to put their emphasis to focus on the problems.
- RU program evaluations – if not doing them, how will we earn the staff. Need accountability to make sure that staff are doing them.
- What does self-reporting of self audits mean? They do the inspection and we audit a percentage of their self-reporting forms.
- If we keep doing the RU program the way it is, we need to pull the grant program back to the Waste Management program. If we don't keep the program (the audits), then perhaps the grant program should review the self-audit checklist, not the WA program.
- Non-metallic – covered with the team,. Expectation that we keep the technical contact in the regions, to answer the questions. In the long-term, may work towards a reduced oversight role. Short-term may not be able to do away with the technical expertise.
- Use technology to answer the technical questions, so that the people doing the audits can also answer the questions.
- Dropping RU program evaluations and bringing together the RUs to provide technical assistance and outreach. Don't be so radical as to drop the RUs, but transition to technical assistance.
- EMS template – how do we reconcile the amount of time this may take vs the stakeholder involvement.
- Enforcement Discretion Memo – shouldn't promote use, we should be doing rules if we're going to issue a memo. Promote enforcement discretion. Don't identify EDM as a policy in and of itself. Also look to a statewide approval like we're doing for the drywall. Issue really with the fact that it's just stated that we use EDM without reference to policy.
- Explain what a Gov.'s blue ribbon task force? Trying to address a specific issue by using a governor appointed task force. Do we want to state it as a given? Is it a long-term group like the metallic mining.

- Review of RY under governor's task force: Promote organics recycling as a piece of this – implementation detail.
- Sunset state oversight for NMM of the counties – is there a proposed time frame? Not really at this time, depends on local govt. achieving the program.
- Outreach needs to include internal training plan. If we identify a need (like WEB work or technical writing) send staff to get that training, since we aren't going to be able to hire more people.
- Work more with C&E program and SHWEC to get the needed outreach
- Green Tier should be paramount in our outreach effort – we have a plan to promote it (explaining what it is and how to apply it).
- Increase outreach and education as a priority in individual PDs. It's always the low-hanging fruit that doesn't get done.
- What is meant by 'place responsibility where it belongs' – manufacturers responsibility, municipalities - explain.
- Stop taking enforcement action vs bring recycling in line. Seems to conflict. Will still need to take some enforcement action, , also the folks that we can't enforce against.
- Roll technical assistance into outreach and education. We should do the work that SHWEC is doing, . We should work to promote the citizens trust of the DNR staff. An example is the OB DVD and materials.
- Who owns the complaint –
- As a short-term we want to hire a contractor, we should make every effort to do the work within DNR and not hire a contractor. We don't develop expertise within the program. Not good.
- As a program, encourage more coordination with LE staff, since they are the first contact in a complaint. Also consistency with them. Also need to continue to improve relations between Enforcement and WA because the systems don't interact, duplication of work.

Options for Bureau Structure

- Option 1 – Salmon, Option 2 watermelon
- Explanation of differences
- Structural changes to regions may dictate which structure occurs in the bureau. How can we provide meaningful input. Discussion on erasing all lines between regions and bureau and feasibility..
- Ask the question of how the structure supports the management systems.
- More integration with Option 1. Administrative services has a stigma. Integration could also be achieved with Chris??suggestion. Could also regionalize – cooperative work that our stakeholders are doing. We should do what our facilities are doing – tri-county agreement.
- Better integration within the program, less working against each other, more cooperation, coordination.
- Positive about Option 2, still provides for expertise within program supervisors that knows the hands-on of the program.
- Option 2 would make it more difficult for a program generalist – they may have to cross over between the 2 section.
- Option 1 better, #2 is silo based, Opt.1 has a bigger view of the program and what should be changed. Limited resources would serve the sections better – keep the

experience in the section especially as it relates to how to develop policy. Still have program experts. Within the environment and the versatility, #1 more adaptable.

- Option 2 is better, generalist concept is not working well within SCR. Easier for the public to understand who to go to.
- Program Implementation – add Integration with other programs (Air, Stormwater).
- Option 2 roles is similar to what the teams are doing now. Team has struggled with their scope of work, it is now listed as a scope. Team would serve as less of a role.
- Need is for experts for support. Where does that really reside. Teams not giving the technical support
- What's the point of commonality of the 2 structures? – Management, and staff
- Thinking of streamlining, adaptability, cost savings – combine the RR/WA bureaus – AI not inclined to combine the 2 programs. We work on sites that we have history on that the RR program does not have. We use the same files, same info, just someone else does it.
- Put down the advantages/disadvantages and then address how the option selected addresses the disadvantage as part of the implementation.
- Put down on Option 1 that there is a SW expert, RY is expert for person , etc.....
- Option 2 is more clear, #1 is versatile.
- Option 1 Green Tier is not obviously listed.
- IT should be with the EA section since it's critical to the outreach.
- Comments on the regional structure? Teams?? Any going away? How the managers work with the teams.
- What does it mean by erasing the lines?. Limiting ourselves by looking at each structure separately. Is there a way to eliminate the we/they between the regions and bureau.
- Blurring of the lines between the regions and bureau may not be responsive to the public – basins – customer doesn't need to know who to go to.
- Perhaps regions should be organized the same way as the bureau.
- Create only one silo through the bureau, rather than the 5 – 6 silos that currently exist.
- Should we give more authority to teams to make decisions.
- Eliminate the AWL from the system. Saves money and may work. Puts more weight on Len's shoulder's, but he could handle it. Have Len report to Sue (or vice versa).
- Where is the reorg – is it dead?? Probably.